



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,238	07/17/2006	Claude Allaire	BCM-005US	9600
54004	7590	03/07/2008	EXAMINER	
MUIRHEAD AND SATURNELLI, L.L.C. 200 FRIBERG PARKWAY SUITE 1001 WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581			NOORI, MAX H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		2855	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/07/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/568,238	Applicant(s) ALLAIRE ET AL.
	Examiner Max Noori	Art Unit 2855

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 19-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 14-18 and 27-37 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement (PTO/146/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/9/08 and 1/14/08

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Saegusa

Regarding claims 1, 19, 23, Saegusa et al., discloses a method of evaluating characteristics of a golf club with features of the claimed invention including an impacting device, an acoustic detection and a controller.

Regarding claim 2, the acoustic detector is a microphone (element 16a).

Regarding claim 3, the impacting device is a hammer (element 14).

Regarding claims 4-5, the controller is connected to the detection device via I/O controller.

Regarding claims 6-7, the I/O controller/computer receives signal from the detector.

Regarding claim 9, the positioning of the various apparatus element does not alter the structure of the apparatus claim; these elements can be positioned in any desirable configuration.

Regarding claim 12, the system has a display (see, element 82d, figure 7A).

Regarding claim 13, the computer usually has data storage.

Regarding claims 20-23, the sample material is probably metal.

Regarding claims 23, 26, the impacting means has a tip and there is means to move the tip.

Regarding claim 24, the tip looks like a tube.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 8, and 25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saegusa et al.

Regarding claim 8, although Saegusa et al., does not elaborate on a mounting table, but since the detecting system must be positioned in firm place, it would have been obvious for a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify Saegusa et al., to provide for a reasonable mounting means in order to obtain a firm situation.

Regarding claim 25, it would have been obvious for a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify Saegusa to make the impacting tip of any desirable material in order to obtain maximum effect.

4. Claims 10-11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saegusa et al., in view of Bohannan et al.

Regarding these claims, even though the concept presented in Saegusa et al., can be equally applied to a rectangular sample, he only recite a golf club. However, the use of acoustic detecting devices, for impacting rectangular samples, is also well known in the art. Bohannan et al., for example, is presented to show such arrangement, for detection of large structure such as high way bridges. It would have been obvious, therefore, for a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify Saegusa et al., in order to use it for any shape structure, resulting in more versatile detecting system.

5. Claims 14-18 and 27-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Max H. Noori whose telephone number is (571) 272-2185. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 P.M.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2800. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. The central fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2855

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Max Noori/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2855

Wednesday, March 12, 2008